

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

TUESDAY

2:00 P.M.

FEBRUARY 27, 2001

PRESENT:

**Jim Shaw, Chairman**  
**Pete Sferrazza, Vice Chairman**  
**Joanne Bond, Commissioner**  
**Jim Galloway, Commissioner**  
**Ted Short, Commissioner**  
  
**Amy Harvey, County Clerk**  
**Katy Singlaub, County Manager**  
**Jim Barnes, Legal Counsel**

The Board met in regular session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

**01-179      WORK CARD PERMIT APPEAL – DAMITA GOODALL**

This appeal was considered on MONDAY, February 26, 2001, prior to the Caucus meeting, the Board having convened with Chairman Shaw presiding, to consider the appeal of DAMITA GOODALL of the Sheriff's denial of her permit application to work as a director in the field of childcare at the Rehoboth Learning Center.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, the Board convened in closed session to hear testimony as to why the work card should or should not be granted. The appellant was present to offer testimony during the closed session. Also present were Maureen Thomas, Chief Records Clerk of the Permits and Registration Department of the Sheriff's Department, Colette Imasaki and David Watts-Vial from the Washoe County Social Services Department, Vahid Behmaram, Utility Services Division and Lonnie Feemster, NAACP President. The Board then reconvened in open session, and the following action was taken.

Having convened in OPEN SESSION, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the Sheriff's denial be overturned and the appeal of DAMITA GOODALL be upheld and the child care work permit be issued.

**01-179A      AGENDA**

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the agenda for the February 27, 2001, meeting be approved with the following change: **Continue Item 6G(1)** to the 5:30 p.m. public hearing portion of the agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Sam Dehne, Reno citizen, expressed his concern about Jeff Griffin, Reno Mayor, having any input on matters concerning the Airport.

Cheryl Phay, Washoe County employee, discussed the differences in salary between the Marriage Clerks and Filing Clerks, who previously had been comparable in salary until the HayGroup Study was conducted. She advised that the University of Nevada Reno contracted with the HayGroup to do a salary study, which when completed was shelved and never implemented.

**COMMISSIONERS' AND MANAGER'S COMMENTS**

Commissioner Sferrazza requested that the salaries for the Marriage Clerks and Filing Clerks be reviewed because that was one position the HayGroup was directed to review.

**MINUTES**

On motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the minutes of the special meeting of January 13, 2001, and the regular meeting of January 23, 2001, be approved.

**01-180      RESOLUTION – SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT NO. 3 – ANTELOPE VALLEY ROAD**

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, said approval of this resolution does not commit the Board to the bonding of this project but does allow the County to be reimbursed for expenditures, if this project goes forward.

Jeanne Fow, Red Rock Property Owners Association, said this project is very important to the citizens of Red Rock. She noted there is overwhelming support for this project from the residents of the area.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following resolution be adopted and Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute:

## RESOLUTION

**A RESOLUTION SETTING FORTH THE INTENT TO REIMBURSE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES WITH BOND PROCEEDS IN CONNECTION WITH A PROPOSED STREET PROJECT IN SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT NO. 30 (ANTELOPE VALLEY ROAD); PROVIDING CERTAIN DETAILS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; AND PROVIDING THE EFFECTIVE DATE HEREOF.**

**WHEREAS**, the Board of County Commissioners (herein "Board") of the County of Washoe (herein "County") in the State of Nevada is of the opinion and has determined and does hereby declare that the interest of the County of Washoe requires the acquisition and improvement of a street project as defined in NRS §271.225 (the "Project"); and

**WHEREAS**, for the purpose of designation and identification it is desirable that the hereinafter described Project be known and identified as "Washoe County, Nevada, Special Assessment District No. 30 (Antelope Valley Road)" (the "Improvement District" or "District"); and

**WHEREAS**, the Board expects to incur certain expenditures relating to the Project prior to obtaining financing and the County intends to reimburse itself for such prior expenditures with the proceeds of interim warrants or special assessment bonds (such warrants or special assessment bonds are referred to herein as the "Bonds") issued in the maximum principal amount of \$3,100,000.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF WASHOE, NEVADA:**

Section 1. All action, proceedings, matters and things heretofore taken, had and done by the Board, and the officers thereof (not inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution) directed toward the Project and the financing thereof be, and the same hereby is, ratified, approved and confirmed.

Section 2. The County hereby declares its intent to reimburse the costs of the Project out of the Bonds. This is a declaration of official intent under § 1.150-2 of the Regulations promulgated under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended. The Council hereby determines and declares that:

(a) The County intends to incur expenditures with respect to the Project prior to the incurrence of the Bonds and to reimburse those expenditures from the proceeds of the Bonds; and

(b) The payment of costs related to the Project and the reimbursement of such costs from the proceeds of the Bonds is consistent with the County's budgetary and financial circumstances as of the date of this Resolution. The County does

not currently have moneys which are, nor does the County reasonably expect moneys to be, allocated on a long-term basis, reserved or otherwise available pursuant to the County's budget to pay the expenditures which the County intends to reimburse.

(c) The maximum principal amount of Bonds expected to be used to reimburse such expenditures is \$3,100,000.

Section 3. All resolutions, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this resolution, are hereby repealed to the extent only of such inconsistency. This repealer shall not be constructed to revive any resolution, or part thereof, heretofore repealed.

Section 4. If any section, paragraph, clause or other provision of this resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, clause or other provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this resolution.

Section 5. This resolution shall become effective and be in force immediately upon its adoption.

**01-181            JUVENILE SERVICES – 34th ANNUAL RECOGNITION  
LUNCHEON – COMMUNITY RELATIONS**

Upon recommendation of Kathy Carter, Community Relations Director, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the request to fund six foster grandparents to attend the 34<sup>th</sup> Annual Recognition Luncheon be approved.

**01-182            PARKS AND RECREATION – 2001 FEE SCHEDULE**

Upon recommendation of Doug Mullens, Recreation Superintendent, through Karen Mullen, Parks & Recreation Director, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the addition of the fees listed on Exhibit A to the Parks and Recreation Department's Year 2001 Fee Schedule be approved. (A copy of Exhibit A has been placed on file with the Clerk's office.)

**01-183            REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #2274-01/PW – VIDEO  
PRODUCTION SERVICES – HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

This was the time to consider award of bid, Notice to Bidders for receipt of sealed bids having been published in the Reno-Gazette Journal on January 11, 2001, for Video Production Services, on behalf of the Washoe County Health Department. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

A sole bid, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, was received from the following proposer:

Christopher Blanton Productions

Upon recommendation of John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that RFP No. 2274-01/PW for Video Production Services, on behalf of the Air Quality Management Division of the Washoe County Health Department, be awarded to the sole proposer, Christopher Blanton Productions, in the estimated amount of \$50,000.

**01-184            CRIME LABORATORY – APPLIED BIOSYSTEMS 310 GENETIC ANALYZER – DNA SECTION – SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT**

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office Crime Laboratory be authorized to purchase an Applied Biosystems 310 Genetic Analyzer for use in the DNA section.

It was noted that this unit is identical to the one already in use in the laboratory, and the cost of the purchase will be paid from an existing Federal DNA Grant, the laboratories deferred accounts and the fine revenue collected from convicted offenders.

**01-185            CRIME LABORATORY – DEFERRED FUND MONIES – MOBILE HIGH DENSITY FILE CABINET – SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT**

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office be authorized to use the Crime Laboratory’s Deferred fund monies to purchase a mobile, high density file cabinet at a cost of \$14,981.62.

It was noted that there were only two bids for this system. The preferred bid was from Machabee Office Environments at a cost of \$14,981.62. The second bid was from Advanced Warehouse Systems in the amount of \$14,996.00. Both costs include installation.

**01-186            COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT – ATTORNEY GENERAL’S OFFICE – COMPUTER CRIMES UNIT – SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT**

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Cooperative Agreement between the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office and the State of Nevada, specifically the Office of the Attorney General, for the creation of a

Computer Crimes Unit be approved and Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute on behalf of the Commission.

**01-187      WATER RIGHTS APPLICATIONS 66635 AND 66636 – PERMITS  
34481 AND 35582 – WATER RESOURCES**

This item was continued to the public hearing portion of today's agenda.

**01-188      WATER RIGHTS DEED – HAWCO DEVELOPMENT COMPANY  
– WATER RESOURCES**

Upon recommendation of John Collins, Manager, Utility Services Division, through Ed Schmidt, Director of Water Resources Department, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that:

1.      The Water Rights Deed for 18.00 acre-feet of surface water rights from a portion of Claim 524 between Hawco Development Company as Grantor and Washoe County as Grantee be approved; and
2.      Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute the Water Rights Deed.
3.      The Utility Services Division Manager be directed to record the Water Rights Deed with the Washoe County Recorder.

**01-189      AGREEMENT – CH2M HILL INC – THIRD PARTY REVIEW OF  
SOUTH TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER RECLAMATION  
FACILITY EXPANSION PROJECT BID DOCUMENTS – WATER  
RESOURCES**

Upon recommendation of John Collins, Manager, Utility Services Division, through Ed Schmidt, Director of Water Resources Department and Jess Traver, P.E., County Building Official, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the contract for Third Party Review of South Truckee Meadow Water Reclamation Facility (STMWRF) Expansion Project Bid Documents, to CH2M Hill Inc., in the amount of \$38,000, be approved and Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute. It was further ordered that the Utility Services Division Manager be authorized to issue the Notice to Proceed.

**01-190      AMEND WATER SALE AGREEMENT – ECCLES RANCH  
ESTATES UNIT NO. 1 – SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY –  
WATER RESOURCES**

Upon recommendation of John Collins, Manager, Utility Services Division, through Ed Schmidt, Director of Water Resources Department, on motion by Com-

missioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that:

1. The Amended Water Sale Agreement between Washoe County and Sierra Pacific Power Company for 12.40 acre-feet of surface water rights from Claim 83 be approved; and
2. Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute the Amended Water Sale Agreement.
3. The Utility Services Division Manager be directed to record the Amended Water Sale Agreement with the Washoe County Recorder.

**01-191      RESOLUTION – ADOPTING THE AMENDED SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN (CPOOSE-001) – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Upon recommendation of Sandra Dutton, Planner, Community Development, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following resolution be adopted and Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute:

**RESOLUTION**

**ADOPTING THE AMENDED SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN (CPOOSE-001), A PART OF THE WASHOE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**WHEREAS**, Section 278.150 and 278.210, Nevada Revised Statutes, specifies that the Washoe County Planning Commission may prepare, adopt and amend a master (comprehensive) plan for all or any part of the County, subject to County Commission approval;

**WHEREAS**, The Washoe County Planning Commission has found that the SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN, a part of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan, and the most recent amendment, provides a long-term general plan for the development of the County including the subject matter currently deemed appropriate for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan;

**WHEREAS**, Section 278.220, Nevada Revised Statutes, specifies that the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, may adopt and endorse plans for Washoe County as reported by the Planning Commission, in order to conserve and promote the public health, safety and general welfare;

**WHEREAS,** A public hearing on the adoption of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan, including the SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN, was first held on May 21, 1991, with the most recent amendment to the SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN being held on July 25, 2000, by the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada;

**WHEREAS,** At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board of County Commissioners endorsed the amendment to the SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN, a part of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to Section 278.0282, Nevada Revised Statutes, for conformance review with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan;

**WHEREAS,** A public hearing for the review of conformance of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan, including the SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN, was first held on October 23, 1991, with the most recent amendment to the SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN being held on October 11, 2000 and November 29, 2000, by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission, and on December 14, 2000 by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Governing Board, at which time the plan was deemed in conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan; and

**WHEREAS,** The amendment to the SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN, a part of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan, which is in conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, has completed all the necessary requirements for adoption as specified in the Nevada Revised Statutes and Article 820, Amendment of Comprehensive Plan, of the Washoe County Development Code; now, therefore, it is hereby

**RESOLVED, BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA,** That the Board does hereby adopt and endorse the amended SOUTHEAST TRUCKEE MEADOWS AREA PLAN, a part of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan, to serve as a guide for the orderly growth and development of Washoe County, Nevada.

**01-192            APPEARANCE – KAREN MULLEN – PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT**

Karen Mullen, Parks & Recreation Director, reviewed a power point presentation with the Board. She stated the Washoe County Parks and Recreation Department was created in 1962 as the regional provider of parks, open space and trails; and that Washoe County Parks Department is a 24 hour, 7 day-a-week, 364 day per year operation with annual visitation exceeding 2.25 million. Ms. Mullen reviewed Fiscal Year 2000/2001 budget appropriations, and noted that parks construction projects are funded through the Parks Construction Tax, Alturas Mitigation funds, Parks, Open Space and Trails bond and CIP budgets. She provided the general fund revenue sources and general

fund expenditures by function. Ms. Mullen said the Infrastructure Preservation should be 6%, not 0%. Notable accomplishments are as follows:

- \* Passage of the \$38 million Parks, Libraries, Trails & Open Space bond.
- \* The opening of the Lazy 5 Regional Park.
- \* The opening of the Sun Valley Teen Center – scheduled for March 2001.
- \* Converted in-house weed abatement and pest control to outside vendors.
- \* Completed three skateboard parks, with another on the way at Lazy 5.
- \* Completion of the Lear Garden.
- \* The addition of sound and lighting systems to the Robert Z. Hawkins Amphitheater.
- \* Completed construction of the Herman Pond trail and boardwalk.
- \* Completed construction of Mayberry Park and Callahan Park.
- \* Received a total of \$738,088 in cash donations and gifts.
- \* Received assistance from 430 volunteers, who provided over 12,500 hours of labor.
- \* Added over 350 acres of open space.

Commissioner Sferrazza inquired about budget appropriations versus general fund resources. Katy Singlaub, County Manager, said the general fund also supports the general parks programs not just the programs that receive fees.

Commissioner Galloway inquired about depreciation and facility maintenance. Ms. Mullen said infrastructure preservation amounts to about 4 percent of the budget, and annually the Parks Department receives \$332,000, which is strictly for capital replacement i.e., tennis court resurfacing, playground equipment, etc.

Gary Schmidt, area resident, stated he is a 30-year resident of Washoe County and complimented Ms. Mullen on her presentation. He said there is approximately 120 acres of private property adjacent to Galena Park that Washoe County Parks Department should consider purchasing.

**01-193      WASHOE COUNTY SUGGESTION PROGRAM**

Darin Conforti, Senior Administrative Analyst, acknowledged the employees being recognized for innovative suggestions that result in cost savings to the County. He reviewed the suggestions and monetary awards the County Suggestion Program Committee approved for each suggestion submitted. Chairman Shaw presented certificates of recognition to the following recipients:

<b><u>Initial Award</u></b>	
Mark Johnson	\$100
Tom Frugoli	\$100
Harlene Greesham	\$100
Jim Gale	\$ 50
Tom Frugoli	\$ 50

**Savings Award**

Tim Riley \$645.60

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Sferrazza, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw acknowledged the suggestions submitted by the above-named employees.

**01-194      SPECIAL RECOGNITION AWARD – DEPUTY ED WALTERS –  
INMATE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

Darin Conforti, Senior Administrative Analyst, acknowledged Deputy Ed Walters for his innovative idea that resulted in cost savings to the County. He reviewed the suggestion and monetary award the County Suggestion Program Committee approved. Mr. Conforti advised that Deputy Ed Walters suggested the Inmate Assistance Program that was established in January 1994. The Inmate Assistance Program was designed to divert inmates into treatment programs, i.e., drug, alcohol, mental health or to assist with travel arrangements that would release inmates to established support systems such as families, friends, employment or transitional housing. Since the Inmate Assistance was established it has helped more than 4,000 inmates and saved more than 35,000 jail bed days, which has resulted in dollar savings of more than \$6.5 million. The Committee was impressed with the extraordinary success of this program for inmates and the County. For such exemplary public service and dedication, the Committee approved Deputy Ed Walters to receive a one-time savings award of \$2,000. Chairman Shaw presented a certificate of recognition to Deputy Ed Walters.

Ron Longtin, Court Administrator, on behalf of the Judges of the Second Judicial District Court, presented Deputy Ed Walters with a Certificate of Appreciation, for his service to the court and community with distinction.

Deputy Ed Walters thanked everyone for this recognition and expressed his appreciation to all of the participants of this program who make it such a wonderful success. He thanked the Sheriff's office for their continued support of the Inmate Assistance Program.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw acknowledged the suggestion from Deputy Ed Walters.

**01-195      AWARD OF BID – ANDERSON PARK PHASE I – PWP-WA-2001-  
313 – PUBLIC WORKS**

This was the time to consider award of bid, Notice to Bidders for receipt of sealed bids having been published in the Reno-Gazette Journal on February 2 & 7, 2001, for Anderson Park Phase I, consisting of parking, picnic areas a lawn/turf area,

landscaping, irrigation and utilities, on behalf of the Public Works Department. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

Bids were received from the following vendors:

<b>Contractors</b>	<b>Add Alt' 1</b>	<b>Add Alt' 2</b>	<b>Add Alt' 3</b>	<b>Base Bid</b>
Building Solutions	\$17,702.00	\$14,851.00	\$21,863.00	\$207,939.00
Garden Shop Nursery	\$39,000.00	\$17,000.00	\$32,000.00	\$191,000.00
Gradex Construction	\$26,250.00	\$14,762.00	\$27,655.00	\$258,255.00
Horizon Construction	\$23,805.00	\$23,851.00	\$21,800.00	\$196,372.35
Interstate Utility	\$22,500.00	\$22,000.00	\$27,140.00	\$209,083.00
Rapid Construction	\$22,500.00	\$19,000.00	\$18,000.00	\$214,902.00

Upon recommendation of Anthony McMillen, P.E., through Rodney Savini, Capital Projects Manager, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the award of bid for Anderson Park Phase I, PWP-WA-2001-313, on behalf of the Public Works Department, be awarded to the low, responsive, responsible bidder, Garden Shop Nursery Landscape Division, Inc., for the Base Bid plus Add Alternate 2, for two additional picnic shelters, in the amount of \$208,000.00 and Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute the contract documents upon presentation.

**01-196            REGIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING CENTER – SYMTRON SYSTEMS, INC. – FIRE TRAINING PROPS**

Upon recommendation of Rodney Savini, P.E., Capital Projects Division Manager, through Dave Roundtree, Public Works Director, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that staff be directed to purchase fire training props from Symtron Systems, Inc., in the amount of \$582,000.00. (A list of props to be purchased, along with terms and conditions, was placed on file with the Clerk's office.)

It was noted the system recommended is produced by Symtron Systems, Inc. These systems are computer controlled, natural gas live fire-training props. The vendor is the only supplier of natural gas fueled, computer controlled, live fire-training systems. This equipment has been certified per NFPA 86, UL 508, and Intertek Test Laboratory. Essentially, Symtron Systems is the only provider of natural gas fueled live fire training systems that have been certified by a nationally recognized testing laboratory, utilize drawn gas sample gas detection systems, utilize dedicated combustion air blowers and utilize inextinguishable pilot assemblies.

It was further noted that the fire training prop requirements for this facility have been researched and approved by the respective fire jurisdiction representatives, the design/builder and Public Works staff. The Purchasing Department concurs with Public Works that based on requirements and on the information provided by Symtron Systems, Inc., this purchase qualifies for sole source consideration.

**01-197      AGREEMENT – SHERIFF’S OFFICE CRIME LABORATORY –  
STATE OF NEVADA – DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES  
AND PUBLIC SAFETY – BREATH ALCOHOL PROGRAM**

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the contract between the Sheriff’s Office Crime Laboratory and the State of Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety, to provide Forensic Services associated with the Breath Alcohol Program be approved and Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute.

It was noted the Board had originally approved this contract on August 15, 2000. The revenue from services was set at \$188,509.00 for Fiscal Year 1999/2000 and \$188,510 for Fiscal Year 2000/2001. This contract is for the period of January 1, 2001 through June 30, 2001.

**01-198      REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #2273-01/PW – SMOKING VEHICLE  
ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN – HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

Tracie Douglas, Public Information Officer, Air Quality Management Division, District Health Department, submitted information requested from yesterday’s Caucus. She advised that this is their last year for this campaign and they have not yet determined how they will proceed.

Commissioner Bond inquired if there had been any consideration to earmarking some of the funds to help people repair their vehicle when it cannot pass the smog certification. Ms. Douglas responded they are looking into how many people come into the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and say they do not have the money to repair their vehicle to enable them to pass the smog certification. She said that money would not come from the \$200,000 they received for this campaign.

Commissioner Galloway asked if there was data available that showed if the car was repaired after the call was received. Ms. Douglas said that is the responsibility of the DMV in terms of the number of cases they actually open where people have been reported more than once. She said DMV would have to go out and verify that the car is indeed smoking. The person then has approximately 60 days to repair the vehicle before the registration is pulled.

This was the time to consider request for proposals, Notice for receipt of Proposals having been published in the Reno-Gazette Journal on December 27, 2000, for a Smoking Vehicle Advertising Campaign, on behalf of the Washoe County Health Department. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

Proposals were received from the following proposers:

Creative Concepts  
Ding Communications, Inc. & Media Directions, Inc.  
Envision  
Gustin Curtis  
Innerwest Advertising  
KPS/3  
Rose Glen Group

Upon recommendation of John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that RFP No. 2273-01/PW, a proposal for a Smoking Vehicle Advertising Campaign, on behalf of the Air Quality Management Division of the District Health Department, be accepted from the Rose Glenn Group, in the estimated amount of \$200,000.00.

**01-199            APPROVE PURCHASE OF ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT – BID NO. 2221-2000 – 63,000# GVWR TRANSFER TRUCK SYSTEM (WASHOE EDITION) – GENERAL SERVICES**

Upon recommendation of John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the purchase of four new 63,000# GVWR Transfer Truck Systems (Washoe Editions) to include four new trucks with transfer bodies; one transfer trailer; four snow plows; four pedestal mount sander units; and three pedestal mount water tenders, on behalf of the Equipment Services Division of the General Services Department, from Sierra Freightliner in the amount of \$700,588.00 be approved.

It was noted that on April 14, 2000, the Board approved the award of Washoe County Bid No. 2221-2000 for a 63,000# GVRW Transfer Truck System prototype that was intended to reduce the number of trucks in the County's fleet by making each truck more versatile. That approval contained an option for the County to procure additional units of this type and configuration from the successful bidder through June 30, 2001, provided pricing did not increase, and subject to Finance Division and budget approval.

**01-200            APPROVE PERMANENT PART-TIME RECREATION SPECIALIST I POSITION – START-UP FUNDS – SUN VALLEY TEEN CENTER – PARKS DEPARTMENT**

Upon recommendation of Doug Mullens, Recreation Superintendent, through Karen Mullen, Parks & Recreation Director, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that a permanent part-time .83 FTE (1726 hours), Recreation Specialist I position for the Sun Valley Teen Center be approved.

It was further ordered that the expenditure of start-up funds in the amount of \$15,000 for the purchase of equipment necessary to prepare the Teen Center for operation be authorized. It was noted that the Finance Department will come back to the Board for appropriation authority to increase the Parks and Recreation Department's budget, should the Department prove unable to absorb all of those costs.

**01-201            LETTER TO SENATOR HARRY REID – WATER RESOURCES**

Following discussion, upon recommendation of Terri Svetich, Registered Engineer, through Ed Schmidt, Director of Water Resources Department, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the Letter of Support to Senator Harry Reid for Senate Bill 223 and the proposed Final Arsenic Rule, with the language substitution, be approved.

Commissioner Galloway requested that staff be directed to forward a copy of the letter to NAACO. Chairman Shaw said that would be appropriate.

On motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the report submitted by Terri Svetich be acknowledged.

**01-202            INTERVIEWS – WASHOE COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY**

Board members each chose a question to ask each candidate. The candidates waited outside while the Board interviewed each candidate in the following order: Robert William Carroll, Jackie L. Decker, Michael James Houghton, Ginger B. Paulsen, and Carlos A. Vasquez.

Robert Cameron, area resident, said the Board should appoint a person who lives in the noise contour of the airport. He requested the Board appoint someone who will balance out the Airport Authority Board.

Gary Schmidt, area resident, said all of the candidates today are very experienced. The composition of the current Board should be considered when making the appointment today. Mr. Schmidt said he supports Jackie Decker being appointed to the Board.

Following the interviews, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Sferrazza abstaining, Chairman Shaw ordered that Michael James Houghton be appointed to the Washoe County Airport Authority Board.

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*  
**Commissioner Sferrazza left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.**  
\*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*

**01-203**

**2001 TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE –  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Maryann DeHaven, Planner, Community Development, recommended the Board review and adopt the recommended policies.

Fred Lokken, Vice-Chair, Sparks Planning Commission, stated that Sparks citizens are not adequately involved in the regional planning issues. Sparks has a single citywide Citizens Advisory Committee, which normally does not involve itself in planning or land use issues. He would like to see the Sparks Citizens Advisory Committee become more involved in issues; to provide input as well as be included in the dialogue. The sphere of influence for the City of Sparks has worked very well. The designation is fair to property owners and lets them know what direction the City is planning to expand. It is also an internal device because it helps the City know where to set its priorities and what infrastructure may need to be upgraded to meet those expansions.

Commissioner Short said the Washoe County Community Development Department has tried very hard to reach as many people as possible concerning the regional plan update. He inquired what else they could do to reach more people in the City of Sparks. Mr. Lokken responded that maybe Chairman Shaw and Mayor Tony Armstrong could meet and determine how they could include more people into the dialogue.

Ms. DeHaven said there are a few minor word changes in the draft policies presented to the Board today. She reviewed those proposed changes with the Board.

Upon recommendation of Mike Harper, Planning Manager, Community Development, and Maryann DeHaven, Planner, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that receipt of the report by Maryann DeHaven be acknowledged.

**01-204**

**2001 RSCVA RATIFICATION ORDINANCE – BUSINESS  
IMPACT STATEMENT**

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Galloway, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the Ordinance designated by the short title “2001 RSCVA Ratification Ordinance” to be adopted on this date does not impose a direct and significant economic burden upon a business and does not directly restrict the formation, operation or expansion of a business.

**01-205**

**BILL NO. 1289, ORDINANCE NO. 1113 – ISSUANCE OF  
GENERAL OBLIGATION CONVENTION CENTER REFUNDING  
BONDS (2001 RSCVA RATIFICATION ORDINANCE)**

In response to Commissioner Galloway’s inquiry, Jennifer Stern, Swendseid & Stern, Bond Counsel, said there are two resolutions that this ordinance ratifies; one is the possible refunding of the Convention Center bonds that were issued in 2000 for

expansion of the Convention Center, and the other is for possible refunding of Bowling Stadium bonds. Ms. Stern said each one contemplates interest rate savings only. Interest rate savings would have to be shown in each year where there are outstanding maturity of bonds. They would then refinance the bonds for lower interest rates in each year that is being refinanced. She said if the ordinance is adopted, they would not go out into the market for at least 30 days and if it looked like there would not be at least a 3 percent present value savings, then they probably would not sell the bonds because that would not comply with the debt management policy of the authority in the County.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Galloway, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Bill No. 1289, Ordinance No. 1113, entitled, **“AN ORDINANCE DESIGNATED BY THE SHORT TITLE “2001 RSCVA RATIFICATION ORDINANCE”; CONSENTING AND AGREEING TO BE BOUND BY THE PROVISIONS OF THE AUTHORITY’S RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF THE GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) CONVENTION CENTER REFUNDING BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED WITH PLEDGED REVENUES), SERIES 2001A AND RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF THE GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) MULTI-PURPOSE BOWLING FACILITY REFUNDING BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED WITH PLEDGED REVENUES), SERIES 2001B; RATIFYING, APPROVING AND CONFIRMING ACTIONS HERETOFORE TAKEN IN THE AUTHORITY’S FINANCING AND IN THE IMPOSITION, COLLECTION AND ASSIGNMENT OF ROOM TAXES AND THE PLEDGE OF SUCH TAXES TO SAID BONDS; PRESCRIBING OTHER DETAILS IN CONNECTION HEREWITH; AND PROVIDING FOR ITS ADOPTION AS IF AN EMERGENCY EXISTS AND THE EFFECTIVE DATE THEREOF,”** be approved, adopted as if an emergency exists, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**01-206            STATUS REPORT – JAN EVANS JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER – JUVENILE SERVICES**

Leonard Pugh, Director, Juvenile Services, advised that approximately one year ago they went through a master planning and architectural programming process to determine the needs in terms of the population and size of the facility. They took their time and held several public meetings to determine where the site would be and then acquired the land. He said they toured five juvenile facilities in the Pacific Northwest and as a result of that, they modified their facility footprint. By modifying their plans and eliminating both expensive exterior and interior walls they were able to constrain the footprint of the building. It also eliminated the need to purchase the lower pad from the initial proposal, which saved approximately \$900,000. By constraining the building, it has become more energy efficient and made it easier to move juveniles throughout the facility. He stated they are working with Washoe County’s Sheriff’s Department staff to find ways to consolidate kitchen facilities with the County’s jail facility. The County jail would prepare the food for the juvenile facility and the juvenile facility would transport the food and serve it at their facility. Mr. Pugh said with the current footprint, they have

enough office space at the facility, but later down the road as the population increases, there would be a need for expansion of offices, and part of their plan would be to locate office space for probation staff in Sparks and Reno. The facility will open with 108 beds and have the ability to expand to 144 beds. They will have groups participating in responsible activities in the living unit and move small groups through the dining area and education space through rotation similar to a normal high school.

Commissioner Bond said it is a good idea for the County jail to provide the meals, but she is concerned about whether a new regime in the Sheriff's office could come in and change that system and leave the juvenile facility without a kitchen. Mr. Pugh responded they have worked with the Steering Committee on this project and it was determined they would keep a specific amount of space, and rough in certain fixtures to the kitchen. This would allow them to have an initial savings on equipment purchases, food purchases, etc. If something occurred within the Sheriff's office and it was determined they would no longer prepare the food, there is a safety net to reduce an expensive remodel project in order to be able to prepare food for the facility.

Commissioner Short said if the juvenile facility had to start providing their own food service, they should include items in the construction phase that would be expensive in the event they have to provide their own food service in the future.

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, said they are trying to balance the least cost to the taxpayers by making sure there is a safety net. They do not want to overbuild the kitchen when there is an adequate food service available across the street, but they do want to have the capacity in the event that service breaks down.

Mr. Pugh said they have identified some areas where they can use softer, less expensive building materials and still maintain the security of the building. Some of those areas would be in the educational area. He noted there is containment within the entire complex, which leaves no incentive for the juveniles to damage anything inside the building.

In response to Commissioner Galloway's inquiry, Mr. Pugh said there will be no change to the ultimate capacity of the building.

Commissioner Galloway expressed appreciation to staff for finding a way to finance this project.

**01-207            REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS – JUSTICE FACILITIES**  
**WORKING COMMITTEE**

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, stated Commissioner Sferrazza requested he be contacted by telephone so that he could participate in this item. Staff was unable to get the equipment to work. Commissioner Sferrazza was on a cell phone and stated he was watching the proceedings on SNCAT.

Chuck Weller, Chairman, Justice Facilities Working Committee, presented and reviewed a report on the committee's activities during their eight meetings between January 25 and February 26, 2001, including some preliminary recommendations. He stated it is their recommendation that Reno Municipal Court be constructed in the parking lot just south of the 1 South Sierra court facility. Some of the reasons he cited were: 1) they believe it would be an unconscionable waste not to continue using the 1 South Sierra facility as a courthouse since it is only four years old and is a state-of-the-art criminal justice facility with its separate holding areas and elevators for prisoners, etc.; and 2) the Committee believes that collocation and eventual merging of the Justice and Municipal Courts, as recommended in the Rose Commission report, is the right way to go and will improve the overall efficiency of both courts resulting in significant savings of taxpayer dollars. Mr. Weller listed areas in which savings could occur by collocation totaling up to over \$3-million in a ten-year timeframe.

Mr. Weller discussed collocation of all the courts, District, Justice and Municipal, at the Pioneer Inn site, stating from what they have analyzed so far, it appears the savings would be an additional million dollars in ten years, but that would also result in abandoning over \$6-million in courtroom improvements in the 1 South Sierra facility. He stated another factor is the City of Reno has indicated they want Municipal Court as close to their new City Hall as possible and suggested the County might consider offering space at the Pioneer site for Reno City Hall.

Mr. Weller further explained the Committee is recommending asbestos abatement begin on the Pioneer Inn immediately and it be razed as soon as possible, but the Conklin Building not be torn down at this time because of the positive cash flow from the existing leases.

Mr. Weller stated it became clear to them the 60-day timeframe would not allow them to thoroughly review every aspect, so they have concentrated on the location of the Reno Municipal Court and what should be done at the Pioneer Inn site. He asked that the Committee be given an additional 60 days to review and address remaining issues and consider other options.

Commissioner Short asked if the idea of locating Reno Municipal Court on the suggested site has been discussed with Reno. Mr. Weller advised they invited the City of Reno to participate and two Council members did come to one meeting. He further advised that he personally wrote to all of the judges requesting they participate, and he received a response from Judge Hickman, which basically stated that the judges know the new courts are going to be built at the Pioneer site and what the committee is looking at is not going to be considered.

Commissioner Galloway suggested that Mr. Weller and a couple of the other committee members present this same report to the Reno City Council. Katy Singlaub, County Manager, stated she would present a request to Reno. Commissioner Galloway stated Reno was only considering the Pioneer Inn site in the beginning, but some of the dynamics have now changed.

Mr. Weller stated the next committee meeting is with the planners; the one after that is with the Court Administrator from Las Vegas where they have already done this consolidation; and they will extend specific invitations to the Reno Mayor and Council members to attend those meetings.

Gary Schmidt, area resident, complimented the work the committee has been doing, stating he has attended three of their meetings. He urged the Board to seriously consider the County-owned property located across the street from the Administration Complex for consolidating all County functions in one location, stating citizens do not want to go downtown because it is hard to get there and, when you finally get there, it is difficult to park. Mr. Schmidt stated the focus on the court system has been on the efficiencies on the criminal side, but there is also a civil side and the travel back and forth between downtown and this complex by the District Attorney's staff, the County Clerk's staff, etc., should also be considered. He further stated if a citizen wants to get Planning Commission minutes on a land use item, they have to go to the Ninth Street complex; and then to get the minutes for this Board, they have to go downtown, which makes no sense.

Chairman Shaw asked if Mr. Schmidt had given this information to the committee. Mr. Schmidt stated he has.

Via telephone, Commissioner Sferrazza requested the vote of the committee members on these recommendations. Mr. Weller stated the vote on requesting an extension of time was unanimous; the vote on the site for Reno Municipal Court was 10 to 5; and the vote on razing the Pioneer was greater than 10 to 5.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion carried unanimously by all five Board members, Chairman Shaw ordered that the preliminary report and recommendations from the Justice Facilities Working Committee be accepted. Noting that a joint meeting between the City of Reno and Washoe County has been scheduled for March 20, 2001, Mr. Weller asked if the Board would like the committee to present a report at that meeting. The Board indicated that was a very good idea.

\* \* \* \* \*  
**Commissioner Sferrazza did not participate in the remainder of the meeting.**  
\* \* \* \* \*

**01-208            FUTURE SUPPORT FOR JULY 4TH EVENTS – PARKS**

Gregg Finkler, Parks Operations Superintendent, reviewed options available to the Board to support upcoming July 4<sup>th</sup> events in the Truckee Meadows as outlined in the agenda memorandum. He stated he has just learned that the City of Reno has placed \$25,000 in their budget to fund the Skyfire event at Rancho San Rafael and has urged that the County match the amount. Mr. Finkler then responded to questions from Board members concerning prior funding of Skyfire by the County and stated if the

County funds an amount less than \$25,000, Reno will probably match the County amount, and Skyfire will have to raise the rest.

Commissioner Bond stated it appears the City of Sparks is planning a major event; and, while she does not object to having two events, she questions whether there is enough public support for two events.

Chairman Shaw stated he does not want to compete with Sparks, but he would hate for the County not to have the traditional fireworks display at Rancho San Rafael. He said he would recommend Option 2, financial support in the amount of \$25,000 for the Skyfire event.

Commissioner Short was not comfortable with the \$25,000 and suggested \$10,000 plus the fee waiver to Skyfire. He stated he would like to help the City of Sparks out also. Mr. Finkler stated it takes \$45,000 to \$48,000 to produce the Skyfire event, but Skyfire also gets a lot of money from private sources and generates revenue at the event. He also disclosed that he serves on the Skyfire Board as the Department representative.

Commissioner Bond suggested a \$10,000 contribution to Skyfire and \$5,000 to the City of Sparks in an effort to make both events a success. Commissioner Galloway suggested combining the two events. Commissioner Bond stated the Reno money would probably not be available if that was done.

Chairman Shaw stated he feels both events will be well-attended. Commissioner Galloway stated Sparks has not demonstrated that they need funding and Sparks has not contributed to Skyfire in recent years.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that financial support in the amount of \$10,000, plus a waiver of the \$2,000 fee for use of Rancho San Rafael, be provided to Skyfire for the July 4, 2001 event, and that \$5,000 be earmarked to support the event by the City of Sparks if needed.

**01-209            PUBLIC HEARING – REFUNDING REVENUE BOND – SIERRA  
PACIFIC POWER COMPANY - \$80,000,000**

**5:30 p.m.** This was the time set for continued consideration of the proposal to issue refunding revenue bonds of the County in one or more series in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$80,000,000 for the purpose of refunding a like principal amount of the County's revenue bonds previously issued for the purpose of financing costs to Sierra Pacific Power Company of certain facilities located in the County and used in connection with the furnishing of water available on reasonable demand to members of the general public. This was continued from the meeting of February 13, 2001.

Chairman Shaw opened the public hearing by calling on anyone wishing to speak.

Pursuant to discussion at Caucus, John Sherman, Finance Director, explained these are Economic Development Revenue Bonds; Sierra Pacific Power Company is seeking to refinance \$80,000,000 worth of bonds that were used to pay for the Chalk Bluff water treatment facility; and they have approached the County because this Board has the jurisdiction and responsibility to approve the issuance of those bonds. He stated the calculations indicate that refinancing these bonds would have a net present value savings of approximately \$2,000,000; however, assumptions built into the refinancing indicate that the bonds will have to have an investment grade rating or be insured. Mr. Sherman said he has discussed this issue with Sierra Pacific Power Company and both their bond counsel and the County's bond counsel; and he is proposing a condition be placed on the bonds to address this concern, which he read into the record and placed on file with the Clerk.

Mr. Sherman further stated these bonds can never become an obligation of Washoe County, nor can they become an obligation of the recently created Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA). There is no direct relationship between these bonds and the obligation to pay these bonds and any activities of the TMWA in buying the water assets of Sierra Pacific.

Mr. Sherman and John Swendseid, Bond Counsel, responded to Board members' questions explaining that the condition will provide staff the flexibility and discretion necessary to determine if the bond sale, which is not scheduled to occur until March, is in the best interest of the County.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Shaw closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Short moved to adopt the resolution authorizing the issuance of the bonds subject to the condition outlined by staff. Commissioner Galloway stated he would second the motion with direction to staff that, in exercising this discretion, Mr. Sherman will also consider whether the issuance benefits the ratepayers. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously and it was ordered that the following resolution be adopted and Chairman Shaw be authorized to execute, subject to the condition that in the event the Refunding Bonds to be issued for Sierra Pacific Power Company are not insured or rated with an investment grade rating, the Finance Director shall have the authority to cancel or delay the Refunding Bond sale:

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 01-209**

**RESOLUTION APPROVING PLAN OF FINANCING;  
AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF  
\$80,000,000 WATER FACILITIES REFUNDING  
REVENUE BONDS (SIERRA PACIFIC POWER  
COMPANY PROJECT) SERIES 2001 TO REFUND  
BONDS PREVIOUSLY ISSUED TO FINANCE  
COSTS FOR SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY**

**OF CERTAIN FACILITIES FOR FURNISHING OF WATER AVAILABLE ON REASONABLE DEMAND TO MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF AN INDENTURE OF TRUST FROM SAID COUNTY TO THE BANK OF NEW YORK, AS TRUSTEE, WITH RESPECT TO SAID BONDS; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF A FINANCING AGREEMENT BETWEEN SAID COMPANY AND SAID COUNTY PROVIDING FOR THE REPAYMENT OF THE LOAN OF THE PROCEEDS OF SAID BONDS; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF A BOND PURCHASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SAID COUNTY AND LEHMAN BROTHERS INC. AND A.G. EDWARDS AND SONS, INC. AS THE UNDERWRITERS OF SAID BONDS; AUTHORIZING THE ACCEPTANCE OF AN INDUCEMENT LETTER FROM SAID COMPANY; AND RELATED MATTERS.**

**WHEREAS**, Washoe County, Nevada (the "County") is a political subdivision of the State of Nevada authorized and empowered by the County Economic Development Revenue Bond Law, Sections 244A.669 to 244A.763 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, as amended (the "Act"), to issue revenue bonds to finance one or more projects, including any land, building, structure, facility, system, fixture, improvement, appurtenance, machinery, equipment, or any combination thereof or any interest therein, used by any corporation (including a public utility) in connection with the furnishing of water if available on reasonable demand to members of the general public, and to refund the same; and

**WHEREAS**, the Act provides that such revenue bonds shall be payable solely and only from the revenues derived from a project, including payments under a lease, agreement of sale or financing agreement or under notes, debentures, bonds and other secured or unsecured debt obligations executed and delivered by the obligor pursuant to such lease, agreement of sale or financing agreement; and

**WHEREAS**, the Act provides that such revenue bonds of the County shall be secured by a pledge of the revenues out of which such bonds shall be payable, and if title to or in such project remains in the obligor, such bonds shall also be secured by a pledge of one or more notes, debentures, bonds or other secured or unsecured debt obligations of the obligor; and

**WHEREAS**, the County has heretofore issued its \$80,000,000 aggregate principal amount Water Facilities Revenue Bonds (Sierra Pacific Power Company Project) Series 1990 (the "Prior Bonds") in order to finance costs to Sierra Pacific Power

Company (the "Company") of certain facilities located in the County and used by the Company in connection with the furnishing of water available on reasonable demand to members of the general public; and

**WHEREAS**, the Company has requested the County to issue its Water Facilities Refunding Revenue Bonds (Sierra Pacific Power Company Project) Series 2001 (the "Bonds") in one or more series in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$80,000,000 in order to refund all or part of the Prior Bonds; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to notice published in the "Reno Gazette-Journal" on January 30 and 31, 2001, this Board conducted a public hearing (on February 13, 2001 and at the meeting at which this resolution is being adopted and prior to the adoption hereof) on the proposal to issue the Bonds for the purpose specified above; and

**WHEREAS**, all who appeared at such public hearing were given an opportunity to express their views for or against such proposal, and this Board has considered all oral and written statements, if any, in favor of the proposal and all oral and written objections, if any, against the proposal, and has determined that it is advisable to proceed with such proposal; and

**WHEREAS**, the proceeds of the Bonds in the principal amount of \$80,000,000 will be loaned to the Company for the purpose of refunding the Prior Bonds pursuant to a Financing Agreement, to be dated as of March 1, 2001 (the "Financing Agreement"), by and between the Company and the County, whereby the Company will covenant and agree (i) to make payments (directly to the Trustee hereinafter identified, as the County's assignee, pursuant to such Financing Agreement) sufficient to provide for the payment of the principal of and interest and premium, if any, on the Bonds, as and when the same become due and payable, and (ii) to make such other payments and satisfy such other obligations as may be required by the Act; and

**WHEREAS**, the Bonds will be issued under and pursuant to, and are to be secured by, an Indenture of Trust, to be dated as of March 1, 2001 (the "Indenture"), by and between the County and The Bank of New York, as trustee (the "Trustee"); and

**WHEREAS**, the County proposes to enter into a Tax Exemption Certificate and Agreement (the "Tax Agreement") among the County, the Company and the Trustee in order to implement certain procedures with respect to the tax-exempt status of interest on the Bonds; and

**WHEREAS**, it is proposed that the Bonds will be sold by the County to Lehman Brothers Inc. and A.G. Edwards and Sons, Inc. (the "Underwriters") pursuant to a Bond Purchase Agreement (the "Bond Purchase Agreement") between the County and the Underwriters; and

**WHEREAS**, it is proposed that the Company will deliver to the County and the Underwriters an Inducement Letter (the "Inducement Letter") setting forth certain

representations, warranties and covenants of the Company in connection with the sale and purchase of the Bonds; and

**WHEREAS**, the County has received a five-year operating history from the Company;

**Now, THEREFORE, Be it Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, as follows:**

**Section 1.** That the plan of financing which contemplates the issuance of the Bonds by the County in one or more series in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$80,000,000 to refund a like principal amount of the Prior Bonds, as referred to in the preamble hereof, is hereby approved in principle.

**Section 2.** That, in order to refund a like principal amount of the Prior Bonds previously issued for the purpose of financing for the Company costs of certain facilities located in the County and used by the Company for the furnishing of water available on reasonable demand to members of the general public (the "Project"), the Bonds be and the same are hereby authorized and ordered to be issued in the aggregate principal amount of \$80,000,000 pursuant to the Indenture in substantially the form presented to the Board at the time of the adoption of this resolution and containing substantially the terms and provisions set forth therein, and the forms, terms and provisions of the Bonds and the Indenture are hereby approved, and the Chairman of this Board and the County Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute, attest, seal and deliver the Indenture, and the Chairman of this Board, the County Clerk and the County Treasurer are hereby authorized and directed to execute, attest, countersign, seal and deliver the Bonds as provided in the Indenture, including the use of facsimile signatures on the Bonds, if appropriate. The Bonds shall (i) be in such denominations; (ii) bear such date; (iii) mature at such time; (iv) bear interest at such interest rates fixed or determined from time to time according to a specified standard and procedure, as provided in the Indenture; (v) be in such form; (vi) carry such registration privileges; (vii) be executed in such manner; (viii) be payable at such place or places within or without the State; (ix) be subject to such terms of redemption; and (x) be subject to such other terms and conditions, all as provided in the Indenture.

**Section 3.** That the County lend the proceeds of the Bonds to the Company to refund a like principal amount of the Prior Bonds pursuant to the Financing Agreement in substantially the form presented to the Board at the time of the adoption of this resolution and containing substantially the terms and provisions (including repayment provisions) set forth therein, and the form, terms and provisions of the Financing Agreement are hereby approved, and the Chairman of this Board and the County Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute, attest, seal and deliver the Financing Agreement.

**Section 4.** That the form, terms and provisions of the Tax Agreement, in substantially the form presented to the Board at the time of the adoption of this resolu-

tion, and containing substantially the terms and provisions set forth therein, are hereby approved, and the Chairman of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver the Tax Agreement.

**Section 5.** That the sale of the Bonds to the Underwriters pursuant to the Bond Purchase Agreement, in substantially the form presented to the Board at the time of the adoption of this resolution and containing substantially the terms and provisions set forth therein, is hereby authorized, approved and confirmed, and the form, terms and provisions of the Bond Purchase Agreement are hereby approved, and the Chairman of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver the Bond Purchase Agreement.

**Section 6.** That the form, terms and provisions of the Inducement Letter in substantially the form presented to the Board at the time of the adoption of this resolution and containing substantially the terms and provisions set forth therein, are hereby approved, and the Chairman of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to accept the Inducement Letter on behalf of the County by executing the same and delivering a copy thereof to the Company.

**Section 7.** That it is hereby found, determined and declared that the Bonds and interest and premium, if any, thereon shall never constitute the debt or indebtedness of the County within the meaning of any constitutional or statutory provision or limitation and shall not constitute nor give rise to a pecuniary liability of the County or a charge against its general credit or taxing powers, but the Bonds and interest and premium, if any, thereon shall be payable solely and only from the revenues derived from the Financing Agreement (except to the extent paid from the proceeds of the Bonds), including payments on any bond insurance which may be provided.

**Section 8.** That the County hereby finds and determines that (i) the amount necessary in each year to pay the principal of and interest on the Bonds is set forth in the Financing Agreement as a formula which will insure that the Company is obligated to pay amounts sufficient to pay the principal of, and interest and premium, if any, on, the Bonds and said formula is hereby found to be sufficient for such purposes; (ii) no reserves are necessary or advisable in connection with the retirement of the Bonds or the maintenance of the Project or for any other purpose; (iii) the Company has sufficient financial resources to meet its obligations under the Financing Agreement; (iv) the Company is obligated under the Financing Agreement to maintain the Project and carry all proper insurance with respect thereto for so long as it owns the Project, and the County shall have no obligation whatsoever in these regards; and (v) sufficient safeguards are provided by the Financing Agreement and the Indenture to assure that all money provided by the County through the issuance of the Bonds will be expended solely for the purpose of refunding the Prior Bonds.

**Section 9.** That the Bonds may be insured by a municipal bond insurance policy issued by AMEBIC Assurance Corporation, if requested by the Company at the time of execution of the Bond Purchase Agreement.

**Section 10.** That the use by the Underwriters of the Preliminary Official Statement and the final Official Statement (each as defined in the Bond Purchase Agreement) relating to the Bonds be and the same is hereby acknowledged; provided, that the County neither has nor assumes any responsibility as to the accuracy or completeness of any of the information contained in the Preliminary Official Statement or the final Official Statement.

**Section 11.** That the Chairman of this Board, the County Treasurer and the County Clerk, or any of them, are hereby authorized and directed to execute, attest, seal and deliver any and all documents, and do any and all things, deemed necessary to effect the issuance and delivery of the Bonds and the execution, delivery and acceptance of the instruments authorized hereby, and to carry out the provisions of such instruments and the intent and purpose of this resolution, including the preamble hereof. In the event of the absence or inability to act of the Chairman of this Board, the County Treasurer or the County Clerk, as the case may be, any actions authorized or directed to be taken by them by this resolution, including without limitation by Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 11 hereof, may be taken by the Vice-Chairman of this Board, the Assistant County Treasurer or the Deputy County Clerk, as the case may be.

**Section 12.** That the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared to be separable and if any section, phrase or provision shall for any reason be declared to be invalid, such declaration shall not affect the validity of the remainder of the sections, phrases and provisions.

**Section 13.** That all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

**Section 14.** That this resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

**01-210            WATER RIGHTS CHANGE APPLICATIONS 66635 AND 66636 –  
RELIANT ENERGY – WATER RESOURCES**

**5:30 p.m.** This was the time set in a Notice of Public Hearing, published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on February 2, 9, and 16, 2001, for the Board to consider Water Rights Change Applications 66635 and 66636 and make a formal recommendation to the State Engineer. The applications, filed by Reliant Energy, propose to transfer a total combined duty of 285.60 acre-feet of water rights from Permits 35581 and 35582, and to change the point of diversion and place and manner of use.

Ed Schmidt, Director, Department of Water Resources, explained the purpose of this hearing is to satisfy NRS 533.363, which is a consideration of a request to change the use and point of diversion for approximately 285 acre-feet of water rights from Washoe County to Storey County.

Chairman Shaw opened the public hearing by calling on those wishing to speak concerning this matter.

Robert Sader, Attorney representing the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center, provided detailed information about the industrial-commercial development of approximately 9,000 acres on the old Asmera Ranch located just south of the Tracy power plant and stretching into Storey County. He said they have developed about 500 acres, 250 of which actually have buildings, roads, etc. built, and the project is going strong and sales are brisk.

Mr. Sader stated this is the first of two applications they are filing for a total transfer of approximately 1,000 acre-feet of water rights, the second application will be coming to the Board in two weeks, and his discussion applies to both applications. The water system for the project is anticipated to be ground water. They have three producing wells, two of which are fully connected, and a water tank in operation. There is a currently operating community water system, community sewer system and a re-use system, all designed very similar to the South Truckee Meadows system. These applications propose to change the water rights from Washoe County onto one of their wells in Storey County to serve the first phase of the project, but they are keeping the place of use in both Washoe and Storey Counties in anticipation that in the future there will also be development on the industrially zoned land in Washoe County. Mr. Sader reported he was contacted some time back by Steve Walker, Washoe County's former Water Management Planner, who asked him if the Storey County industrial park would consider the possibility of supplying sewer and water for Washoe County properties in the future. He indicated that idea was within the realm of possibilities and growth of this water and sewer system could provide infrastructure for Washoe County in cooperation with Storey County. He further indicated that this water and sewer system will be operated by a General Improvement District where the property owners control it.

Commissioner Galloway asked if it would be more prudent for the Board to withhold the transfer until the structure of the District was established that included properties on the Washoe County side of the river. Mr. Sader responded the problem with that is the properties in Washoe County have not applied for their development approvals yet, and they need to move the water now because it is available now from the people that own the water, which may not be the case in the future.

In response to Commissioner Galloway, Mr. Sader stated these are the water rights that were associated with Stampmill Estates. Commissioner Galloway expressed a concern that Stampmill Estates is the only approved housing development in close proximity to this area where all these jobs are being created. He further stated that if Stampmill does not build any more homes, they could sell the rights to someone else who might build houses. Mr. Sader explained that Stampmill reverted the undeveloped portion back to acreage; there are 44 lots and no other development has been approved; and these rights are the extra water rights on that failed project that the developer and the owner of the water rights want to move because they don't intend to develop there.

Commissioner Galloway stated from a regional point of view it would make more sense to keep these rights for homes to be built near this industrial development.

Mr. Schmidt explained the statute provides that the Board may recommend a course of action to the State Engineer but it is not binding on the State Engineer. Commissioner Galloway asked if there was any reason he could not recommend to the State Engineer that these water rights be reserved to service future homes. Mr. Schmidt stated he and his staff know of no way to keep these rights from being transferred.

Commissioner Bond noted the Board can not keep the owner of the water rights from selling his water rights. She asked if the developer wanted to buy the rights because they need them or if they are banking them for the future. She also questioned what assurance Washoe County has that there will be water available if and when development starts on the Washoe County side of the river.

Mr. Sader stated the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center currently owns 2,150 acre-feet of ground water rights, which they anticipate will develop 4,000 acres of their property, or a little less than half, and this water will not be used immediately in the project. He further stated this basin has 8,000 acre-feet in it and there is very little development in the basin, so most of this water is not being used. The water is there and is available for other development, and they are having the U.S. Geological Service (USGS) analyze the recharge.

Chairman Shaw asked whether there is any potential future benefit to Washoe County from this development. Mr. Sader discussed the infrastructure they will be constructing and stated Washoe County could share in that infrastructure, with Storey County concurrence. He advised they have also purchased the McCarran Ranch, which they will be developing someday; they will have to come to Washoe County for approvals; and they will have to show they can provide water and sewer for the development.

Commissioner Bond suggested the Board withhold their endorsement until such time as the infrastructure for the water and sewer is in place and Washoe County has the necessary cooperative agreements with Storey County. She asked if that would influence the State Engineer. Legal Counsel Jim Barnes expressed that it was his understanding that could be a basis for the State Engineer's decision.

Arlyn Libal, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, stated his company is in the process of buying the Tracy Power Plant from Sierra Pacific Power Company. He stated they are concerned about the phased approach to these water rights because they plan to improve and expand the Tracy plant. Mr. Libal stated they are requesting that the future growth of the industrial development in the Truckee River Canyon be tied to the expansion of the power generation system.

Robert Squires, Water Rights Agent for the Tracy Power Station, stated there is only 5,000 acre-feet of recharge in the Tracy segment and one of these applications proposes a change adjacent to Tracy's groundwater well, which would probably

impact their well. He stated in order to preserve the water and everyone's water rights, a pipeline would work better.

E. B. Higginbotham, Plant Manager, Tracy Power Station, stated they are using almost all of their full ground water rights; they have had to drill more wells to continue to extract and use water; and they have drilled several dry holes. He stated he is not convinced that this is not a very limited aquifer or that the recharge is there. Mr. Higginbotham stated he must insist that the Tracy Power Station continue to receive its full water rights to sustain its operations.

There being no one else wishing to speak, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bond noted that no one will probably ever know how much water there is in any of the basins. She stated she is not comfortable endorsing these transfer applications at this time.

Commissioner Short asked Mr. Sader when the USGS survey will be done. Mr. Sader stated the study started last year; they receive preliminary reports periodically; but the study will not be complete until 2003.

Commissioner Galloway moved that staff be directed to notify the State Engineer that Washoe County is withholding endorsement of the change applications at this time because of the concern that the transfers should not proceed until the State Engineer is satisfied regarding the appropriateness of putting the structure for an area-wide sewer and water cooperative system in place first and the possible impacts on the Tracy Power Plant. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bond. Chairman Shaw called for a vote; the motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Sferrazza absent; and it was so ordered.

**01-211            APPEAL – SPECIAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. SW0011-029 –  
AT&T WIRELESS – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**5:30 p.m.**        This was the time set to conduct a public hearing to consider the appeal of Jack Sheets requesting reversal of the Washoe County Planning Commission decision to approve Special Use Permit Case No. SW0011-029 for AT&T Wireless to mount four wireless antennas onto an existing storage structure in accordance with Section 110.324.60(b)(2) and (c)(1)(ii) of the Development Code, and to place a prefabricated ancillary equipment shelter to be used as a base station. The subject property is located at 13415 Welcome Way, just south of Zolezzi Lane. The ±2.14 acre parcel (APN 49-161-22) is designated Low Density Suburban (LDS) in the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan and situated in a portion of Section 24, T18N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada, within Washoe County Commissioner District No. 2.

Sandra Dutton, Department of Community Development Planner, reviewed the staff report, provided background information, and responded to questions

from the Board. She emphasized that the Code clearly does allow wireless communication facilities in Low Density Suburban zoning with the approval of a special use permit; that there would be conditions with which the applicant would have to comply; and that, so far, the applicant has done what has been asked of them. Regarding the issue of collocation, Ms. Dutton stated the site would allow for 12 more antennas; the Code is not clear on collocation; she has drafted a proposed condition that no more antennas be allowed at this site in case the Board wants to do that; but the idea of collocation is to have all the antennas at one site rather than scattered all over.

Chairman Shaw opened the public hearing by calling on those wishing to speak concerning this matter.

Appellant Jack Sheets and Matt Taormina, area residents indicated the neighborhood asked them to present the residents' arguments. Mr. Taormina reported that, at the Planning Commission meeting, AT&T discussed the need for this site to aid in communications in emergency situations. He stated he contacted REMSA and learned that REMSA would support an unobtrusive new cell site as approved by the Citizens Advisory Board. The Citizens Advisory Board did not approve this special use permit. Mr. Taormina stated he also contacted Marty Scheuerman, Operations Chief for Reno and Truckee Meadows Fire Department, and learned their main mode of communication is radio and wireless capacity is not an issue for the Fire Department.

Mr. Sheets stated they take issue with findings 1, 3, and 4 made by the Planning Commission. He discussed finding No. 1 and stated the use is not consistent with the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan, which encourages such uses in commercial areas with a low priority in residential areas. Mr. Taormina discussed finding No. 3, site suitability, and displayed several pictures on the overhead camera of the site and how the antennas would be visible from other nearby locations to substantiate their contention that this site is not suitable and not compatible. Mr. Sheets discussed Finding No. 4, issuance not detrimental, and stated the proposed antennas violate articles of the subdivision's CC&R's; the neighborhood has no telephone poles, no street lights, and no antennas protruding from homes; and four antennas standing 22 feet high and the accompanying 28' X 12' accessory building will be detrimental to the character of the surrounding neighborhood and injurious to adjoining property values. Mr. Sheets further stated this is the first of many antenna proposals the residents and Board will have to consider. He asked the Board to note the many letters from other homeowners associations, Thomas Creek, South Hills, and other area residents and the Southwest Truckee Meadows Citizen Advisory Board.

Mr. Taormina reviewed compromises that could be considered and suggested that public facilities such as pump stations, water tanks, etc., could be used for antenna locations. He displayed a map on the overhead depicting that a water tank, a proposed pump house on Zolezzi Lane, an underground water holding facility and an empty lot are within one mile of the AT&T selected Welcome Way site. They then described the other sites, comparing elevations, etc., stating they are viable sites and suggested the neighborhood might be able to help with landscaping on one of the sites. Mr.

Sheets urged the Board to hold their decision until a proper evaluation of the alternate sites could be conducted.

Mr. Sheets and Mr. Taormina expressed their other concerns regarding noise from the air conditioner units and back-up generators and unsightly poles in an area with underground utilities. They urged the Board to protect and preserve the character of the neighborhood and to assume a leadership role concerning the entire issue of the future of antenna locations.

Chris Wener, representing AT&T, stated AT&T is trying to provide service to its customers by providing coverage to this area and they have gone to great lengths to minimize the visual impacts. He displayed a drawing of the antennas mounted on an existing structure stating they will be very unobtrusive and advised AT&T will comply with all the conditions regarding painting, screening, storing equipment in the shelter, etc. The residents are concerned because this is a commercial use in a residential area, but there will be no commercial activities going on. Mr. Wener further stated the property is not bound by the CC&R's of the neighboring development. He addressed the alternate sites suggested by the residents and stated each of those sites would be viable, but a structure and a tower would still have to be built on any one of those. To address another concern, Mr. Wener stated AT&T would be glad to agree not to allow collocation on this site. He then responded to questions from Board members stating they did go to the CAB meetings, they have examined the other sites, and they have tried to work with the neighbors.

Commissioner Bond asked several questions and Mr. Wener responded that the reason this shed was chosen is because it is the tallest structure in the area and they felt it would be less of an impact to use an existing structure rather than build another one. Mr. Wener also provided technical information concerning how the signals work and displayed a topographical map to explain why they need an optimum elevation. He stated that electronic modeling indicates there would be interference of the service if the antennas were mounted on the water tank.

Commissioner Galloway asked several questions and stated his concern is compatibility with the neighborhood and that this is drawing attention to a large, sheet metal building. He asked if any consideration had been given to refacing the structure. Mr. Wener advised that changing the building was not discussed at the CAB meeting because the residents just wanted this to be somewhere else.

Other area residents had signed up to speak and Chairman Shaw called on them. Randy Jackson stated he would defer to Mr. Sheets and Mr. Taormina. Cynthia Edwards and David Langston submitted written comments on the Request to Speak card, which Chairman Shaw read into the record. Nancy O'Neal stated she and her husband are adamantly opposed to having these antennas directly adjacent to their property.

Chairman Shaw noted that the Board has also received several letters from homeowners who are opposed to this proposal, which will be part of the record.

In rebuttal, Mr. Taormina stated he is a member of the CAB and has been to every meeting AT&T attended. He stated the residents do not have a problem with the alternate sites having poles because there are already poles in those other areas. He discussed the differences in elevations of the sites and indicated the AT&T argument does not make sense. Mr. Sheets noted the coverage area map does not show coverage for Arrowcreek and expressed his concern that once AT&T gets their first permit, they will be back for more antennas to provide more coverage.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Shaw closed the public hearing.

Chairman Shaw expressed a concern about putting antennas in a neighborhood that currently has no poles or antennas because everything is underground. Ms. Dutton explained antennas are under authority of the FCC and the County can not stop them, but Article 324 of the Development Code allows the County to try to mitigate the impacts. Chairman Shaw also noted the vote at the Planning Commission was 4 to 3. Ms. Dutton stated the issue for the Planning Commissioners was having a commercial use in a residential neighborhood.

Commissioner Galloway stated that would explain the finding of consistency. He asked if the applicant was correct when he stated the building on which they propose to mount the antennas could be raised as high as 35 feet. Ms. Dutton stated that would be correct. Commissioner Galloway further stated that the Code provides for collocation, and their intent was not to have a proliferation of antennas. He expressed his desire that to mitigate this impact, the building should be rebuilt or refaced to put a visually acceptable facade on it and to somehow disguise the antennas. Commissioner Galloway suggested denying the permit and having the applicant go back to the Planning Commission with a plan to mitigate the visual impacts.

Commissioner Bond stated there has to be another way to make these antennas less obtrusive. She asked if there was another pole nearby they could collocate on. Mr. Wener stated they do collocate, and they would be glad to put up poles since that is the fastest, easiest, and least expensive method, but the direction from the County was to use existing structures. Commissioner Bond stated the reason these are done on a case-by-case basis is because every situation is different. There are instances where using existing structures is best and other instances where installing poles is a better method.

Commissioner Short stated he believes issuance of this permit would be detrimental and it would set a precedent for future uses.

Mr. Wener stated he would be happy to go back to the neighbors and work with them rather than having the request be denied.

Commissioner Galloway stated the Board should either send this back to the Planning Commission for consideration of additional conditions to mitigate the ap-

pearance of the antennas or deny the special use permit without prejudice so the applicant would not have to wait a year to submit a new proposal.

Robert Sellman, Director, Community Development Department, explained the Board's options are to either approve, deny or continue the item. Sending the project back to the Planning Commission is not appropriate unless the reason is to get clarification on a specific statement or matter.

On motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Galloway, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that the appeal of Jack Sheets requesting reversal of the Washoe County Planning Commission decision to approve Special Use Permit Case No. SW0011-029 be upheld and the special use permit be denied, without prejudice, based on the following findings:

1. The proposed use is not consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Comprehensive Plan and the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan.
2. The site is not physically suitable for a wireless telecommunication facility with adequate infrastructure to support the use.
3. Issuance of the permit will be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties, or detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.
4. The Board gave reasoned consideration to the information in the staff report, the information from the Planning Commission, and the information received during the meeting.

**01-212            ADOPTION OF POLICY – RELOCATION ASSISTANCE –  
GENERAL SERVICES**

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, advised the Board that the discussion on this item is restricted to a review of the policy and not whether the policy will be applied in any particular circumstances. Commissioner Galloway noted the agenda memorandum does discuss a fiscal impact of \$400,000 minimum and requested an explanation. Ms. Singlaub reiterated the District Attorney staff advised the discussion should be restricted to the policy in its general application and not the specific application of the policy to a case. She further stated that if the policy was applied in a particular case, it might have that fiscal impact.

Chairman Shaw asked if the \$400,000 should be removed from the policy. Ms. Singlaub stated the \$400,000 is not in the policy; it is in the staff report. She further stated the policy is to bring the County into compliance with state and federal law.

Commissioner Galloway asked whether the \$400,000 fiscal impact would be immediate, in the future, or gradual over time.

Tom Gadd, General Services Director, stated the fiscal impact would be applicable only after individuals had applied for relocation assistance, which would not occur until notice had been given and someone had actually been displaced.

Commissioner Galloway stated that the Board has previously been advised that applying this policy in the case of someone with a month-to-month agreement would be at the Board's discretion. He asked if legal counsel had changed their position in regard to that.

Mr. Gadd explained that what he is suggesting is that the Board adopt the federal uniform policy as the County's policy, which would establish the guidelines for applying the policy when the County either purchases property using federal funds or acquires it through eminent domain. He further cited Nevada Revised Statutes stating that there is nothing in statute that prohibits the payment of relocation benefits to a renter of real property whose tenancy is from month-to-month.

Commissioner Galloway expressed his understanding that there is a potential fiscal impact depending on how the Board wants to apply the policy in other situations.

Commissioner Short asked if the policy would apply when the County purchases property from a willing seller and federal funds are not involved. Mr. Gadd stated if the County purchases property with tenants who have existing leases, the Act would apply.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Shaw ordered that a policy for relocation assistance consistent with applicable federal law and regulations as required by State law (NRS 342.045), including future amendments, be adopted.

\* \* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

---

**JAMES M. SHAW**, Chairman  
Washoe County Commission

**ATTEST:**     **AMY HARVEY**, County Clerk

---

*Minutes Prepared by  
Jeraldine Magee and Sharon Gotchy  
Deputy County Clerks*